UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,506	08/25/2003	Vijay Mital	MSFT-1949/301416.1	4218

41505 7590 09/30/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
LIU, LIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,506	MITAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LIN LIU	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed on 07/02/2008.

Claims 1- 23 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 07/02/2008 with regard to claims 1-9 and 19-23 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments pertain solely to the newly added matter in the claims and the newly formulated below addresses these claims as such.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims **1-6, 8-9, 19 and 21-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by **Tracey et al. (PGPUB: US 2003/0083917 A1).**

With respect to **claim 1,** Tracey teaches a method comprising:

classifying actions associated with first and second service entities, wherein each action is classified according to its availability (Tracey: fig. 3, page 4, paragraph 80, paragraph 6, paragraphs 89 & 95, page 10, paragraphs 158 & 168, noted the actions taken by debtor and collect);

running a context service that matches the first and second service entity the related service entities having different but related metadata attributes (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 165-168, noted the debtor and collector have different metadata attributes but they are related in the same bins table);

determining if an action is available to be performed based on a corresponding classification of the availability of the action for each of the first and second service entities (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168-170); and

displaying the action available to be performed (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168 & 170).

With respect to **claim 2,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein classifying the actions comprises classifying the actions as optimistically available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

With respect to **claim 3,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 2, wherein classifying the actions as optimistically available comprises classifying the actions as available subject to a rule (Tracey, page 6, paragraph 98 and page 18, paragraphs 264-266, noted the rule).

With respect to **claim 4,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the classifying the actions comprises classifying the actions as available according to a rule (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 5,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein classifying the actions as available according to a rule comprises classifying the actions as being available only if the rule is complied with (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 6,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the classifying the actions comprises classifying the actions as universally available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

With respect to **claim 8,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising consolidating the first and second service entities into a context entity (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 164-168) and matching an application entity to the context entity (Tracey, page 12, paragraphs 182-183).

With respect to **claim 9,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising providing a view at an application of the actions available to be performed on each of the related service entities at the application services (Tracey, fig. 8-10, page 15, paragraphs 219-225 and page 16, paragraphs 242-244).

In regard to **claim 19**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 1. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 1 is used to reject claim 19. By this rationale claim 19 is rejected.

With respect to **claim 21,** Tracey teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said action service comprises a tracking mechanism to track performance of the first and the second actions (Tracey, abstract, pages 8-9, paragraph 142).

In regard to **claim 22**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 8. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 8 is used to reject claim 22. By this rationale claim 22 is rejected.

In regard to **claim 23**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 9. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 9 is used to reject claim 23. By this rationale claim 23 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims **10-16 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tracey et al. (PGPUB: US 2003/0083917 A1)** in view of **Evans et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0019560 A1).**

With respect to **claim 10,** Tracey teaches a method for providing to an application an action available to be performed on a first service entity at a first application service, the method comprising:

running a context service that matches a second service entity to an associated context entity derived from the first service entity, wherein the first and second service entities have different but related metadata attributes (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 165-168, noted the debtor and collector have different metadata attributes but they are related in the same bins table),

wherein the first service entity associated with a first distinct application service and the second service entity associated with a second distinct application service can be implemented in Java (Tracey: page 8, paragraph 130 and page 10, paragraph 163),

wherein the first distinct application service is connected via a network to the second distinct application service (Tracey: fig. 1, page 8, paragraphs 137-138);

identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity (Tracey: fig. 2-3, page 10, paragraphs 159-160 & 165-166);

in response to a selection of the first service entity, determining if an action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification of the action according to its availability (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168-170); and

displaying the action available to be performed (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168 & 170).

However, Tracey does not explicitly teach a method of implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language.

In the same field of endeavor, Evans teaches a method of implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language (Tracey: page 9, paragraph 117 and page 14, paragraph 158).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language as taught by Evans in Tracey's invention in order to create highly customized reports for the transaction information (Evans, page 14, paragraph 158).

With respect to **claim 11,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity and a second service entity at a second application service, the first service entity being related to the second service entity (Tracey, figures 1-3, page 8, paragraphs 141-142).

With respect to **claim 12,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is optimistically available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

With respect to **claim 13,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 12, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is available subject to a rule (Tracey, page 6, paragraph 98 and page 18, paragraphs 264-266, noted the rule).

With respect to **claim 14,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first

application service based on a classification that the action is available according to a rule (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 15,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 14, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is available only if the rule is complied with (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 16,** Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service on a classification that the action is universally available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

In regard to **claim 18**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 9. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 9 is used to reject claim 18. By this rationale claim 18 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tracey et al. (PGPUB: US 2003/0083917 A1)** in view of **Brendle et al. (PGPUB: US 2005/0021355 A1).**

With respect to **claim 7,** Tracey teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of determining if performance of the action will result in a conflict.

In the same field of endeavor, Brendle teaches a method of determining if performance of the action will result in a conflict (Brendle, page 11, paragraph 98, noted prevent locking of the actions result in conflict).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of determining result conflict as taught by Brendle in Tracey's invention in order to prevent locking and provide consistent result (Brendle, page 11, paragraph 98).

In regard to **claim 20**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 7. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 7 is used to reject claim 20. By this rationale claim 20 is rejected.

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tracey et al. (PGPUB: US 2003/0083917 A1)** in view of **Evans et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0019560 A1)** and further in view of **Brendle et al. (PGPUB: US 2005/0021355 A1).**

With respect to **claim 17,** the combined method of Tracey-Evans teaches all the claimed limitations, except that they do not explicitly teach a method of determining if performance of the action will result in a conflict.

In the same field of endeavor, Brendle teaches a method of determining if performance of the action will result in a conflict (Brendle, page 11, paragraph 98, noted prevent locking of the actions result in conflict).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of determining result conflict as taught by Brendle in the combined method of Tracey-Evans' invention in order to prevent locking and provide consistent result (Brendle, page 11, paragraph 98).

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lin Liu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1447. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. L./

/Lin Liu/

Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145